DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 134 505 SO 009 738

AUTHOR Brandhorst, Allan R.
TITLE Toward a Taxonomy of Educational Objectives in the Relational Domain.
PUB DATE Nov 76
NOTE 20p.; Paper presented at Annual Meeting of the National Council for the Social Studies (Washington, D.C., November 4-7, 1976)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Affective Behavior; Affective Objectives; Behavior Patterns; Behavior Theories; Cognitive Measurement; *Educational Objectives; Evaluation; Group Behavior; Individual Characteristics; Interaction Process Analysis; *Leadership Qualities; Leadership Responsibility; Measurement; Moral Values; Role Theory; Skill Analysis; *Social Relations; *Social Studies; *Taxonomy

ABSTRACT

A taxonomy of educational objectives which conceptualizes interpersonal skills in terms of measurable behavior is described. The categories represent six aspects of leadership capability--one of them cognitive (conceptualization), one of them cognitive-affective (evaluation), and four of them cognitive-affective-behavioral (leading, following, role-exchange yielding, and role-exchange asserting). In the section on theoretical foundations of the taxonomy, it is maintained that task-oriented group activity requires rotating leadership, based upon sanctions, persuasion, or influence. Nine individual tendencies assumed as critical to achievement of role-exchange yielding and role-exchange asserting functions are listed. The profile of a socially and emotionally mature student who would achieve mastery of the taxonomy objectives is presented, followed by a discussion of the types of learning environments which encourage mastery of the objectives. The relationship between the taxonomy and values education is discussed. The most significant functional value of the taxonomy is providing a structure for evaluating action learning. A bibliography and a copy of the taxonomy are included. (Author/DB)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED134505

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

TOWARD A TAXONOMY OF EDUCATIONAL OBJECTIVES IN THE RELATIONAL DOMAIN

A Paper to be Presented

at the

College and University Faculty Assembly

of the

National Council for the Social Studies Convention

Washington, D.C.

November, 1976

SO 009 738

Allan R. Brandhorst
University of South Carolina

Introduction

The notion of educational objectives as a guide to instructional design and evaluation appears to be an established, permanent feature in curriculum design. A survey of textbooks on curriculum construction would reflect this fact; so also did the popularity of the accountability movement of a few years ago. Increasingly, it is being insisted upon that teachers make their objectives explicit, and use those objectives as a basis for designing instruction.

Perhaps no work has been more influential in the area of educational objectives than the Taxonomy of Educational Objectives: Handbook I: Cognitive Domain under the editorship of Benjamin Bloom. The six categories of Bloom's Taxonomy are perhaps more conventional in educational planning today than any other category system. If use is any measure of the value of something, then certainly Bloom's Taxonomy must be considered one of the great contributions to educational practice.

The success of Bloom's Taxonomy suggests the utility of a taxonomic approach to conceptualizing educational objectives. It would seem that the existence of such a taxonomy provides teachers with a handy reference point for checking their planning. If the taxonomy is in fact being used in this manner, then it is perhaps incumbent upon the profession to make certain that the taxonomy is very exhaustive of the aims of education, or supplement it accordingly, so as to avoid potential warping of the overall curriculum. Such a concern apparently was one of the motivating factors in the development of the Taxonomy of Educational Objectives: Handbook II: Affective Domain; other taxonomies in other domains can be envisioned.

It is to this latter matter that this paper is directed.

The Objectives of Social Education

Robert Havinghurst, writing on the topic of objectives for youth development, summarized the Report of the Panel on Youth, President's Science Advisory Committee, as follows:

Objectives of Self-Development

1. Cognitive and non-cognitive skills necessary for economic independence and for occupational competence.
2. Capability for effective management of one's own affairs.
3. Capability to engage in intense concentrated involvement in an activity.
4. Capabilities as a consumer, not only of goods, but more significantly of the cultural riches of civilization.

Objectives of Social Relations

5. Experience with persons differing in social class, subculture, and in age...concern for people with a diversity of life-style.
6. Experience of having others dependent on one's actions... caring for others who need assistance.
7. Experience of interdependent activities directed toward collective goals...(being a) leader and...follower.

It has always been awkward to identify many of the goals and objectives of social education in terms of the existing categories of the taxonomy in the cognitive domain. If we reflect upon the objectives of self-development and social relation we find a weak match between these objectives and Bloom's cognitive categories. To some extent this is alleviated by the existence of the taxonomy in the

affective domain; however, in reading the literature on objectives, it is difficult to escape the feeling that the implicit intent of educational evaluators is to use affective objectives as means to the end of cognitive objectives. Thus receiving, responding, and valuing are means to the cognitive mastery of subject matter. It has been argued rather persuasively by Gibbons (1974), Kohlberg (1972), Metcalf (1955), Newmann (1975), Oliver and Shaver (1966), and others that the proper means-ends relationship in social education is cognitive mastery of subject matter as means to the end of value decisions and/or citizen action.

If social education is properly social relations centered as opposed to content mastery centered, then it would follow that additional taxonomies of educational objectives with distinctly different orientations may be warranted as supplements to the currently existing taxonomies. The taxonomy advanced here, labelled the Taxonomy of Educational Objectives: Relational Domain, represents an attempt to conceptualize some interpersonal skills in terms of observable behaviors amenable to measurement. (A listing of the categories comprising the taxonomy may be found at the end of this paper; the reader is cautioned, however, against assuming this represents a taxonomy in its present order). Following Schutz (1958) several other taxonomies can be readily envisioned.

The six categories of the relational taxonomy represent six distinct categories of capability, one of them cognitive (conceptualization) one of them cognitive-affective (evaluation), and four of them cognitive-affective-behavioral (leadership, followership, role exchange-yielding, role exchange-

asserting.) Each category is then broken down into three sub-categories, reflecting three different bases of order in a task oriented group, control of sanctions, control through persuasion, and control through the exercise of expert knowledge.

Theoretical Foundations of the Taxonomy of Educational Objectives: Relational Domain

A basic value orientation underlying the structure of the taxonomy is the belief that task oriented group activity requires leadership; furthermore, that leadership may be exercised through the agency of sanctions (power orientation), persuasion (social orientation), or influence (interdependent-cultural orientation);[1] and finally that determination of the most appropriate mode for the exercise of leadership is a function of the purpose of the group. Thus in a routine production task group, i.e., industry, the appropriate agency for the exercise of leadership is the use of sanctions; it would be inappropriate to try to lead on the basis of social attractiveness or some other basis of persuasion. Again, in a policy making group, it would be inappropriate to attempt to lead through the use of sanctions; the appropriate agency of leadership would be persuasion. Finally, in a group attempting to create, the appropriate agency of leadership is special expertise.

Given these basic imperatives of social interaction in groups, the taxonomy

---

[1]Herbert Kelman demonstrated empirically the salience of a quite similar trichotomy of sources of power. Specifically Kelman's compliance process corresponds to the power orientation; his identification process corresponds to the interdependent-cultural orientation. See Kelman, H., "Compliance, Identification and Internalization: Three processes of Attitude Change", Journal of Conflict Resolution, 1958, 2, 51-60.

was designed to foster the acquisition of capabilities for utilization of all three agencies of leadership.

Another basic belief underlying the taxonomy is the position that no one should be a leader on a continuous basis, but rather that in one set of circumstances, a given individual might most appropriately lead, but at another point in time being a follower would be more appropriate; furthermore it is assumed that followership is a learned behavior, and should accordingly be accomodated in a taxonomy of educational objectives; and finally it is assumed that the learned dispositions of followers under the three alternative agencies for the exercise of leadership are psychologically unique, and hence must be identified and pursued as unique categories of objectives.

A third value orientation basic to the taxonomy is the position (belief) that the abilities to expropriate leadership or surrender leadership are unique behavioral capabilities, which are acquired through learning; and the exercise of these capabilities under the agency of different leadership formats is sufficiently unique psychological experience in each case to warrant their separate pursuit as unique objectives.

These value orientations about the nature and scope of power related group activity are generally consistent with the compliance theory of Amitai Etzioni, and the supervisory theory of Rensis Likert.

The conceptualization and evaluation categories of the taxonomy are assumed to be critical to the achievement of the role exchange-yielding and role exchange-asserting categories of objectives. Theoretical support for this assumption

may be found in the body of theory generally known as ego-development theory, and characterized by the developmental schemes elucidated by Kohlberg (1958), Sulivan, Grant and Grant (1957), Loevinger (1976), and most particularly Harvey, Hunt and Schroder (1961). Harvey, et.al., postulate a concrete to abstract dimension of cognitive functioning. People on the more concrete end of the continuum manifest the following features or tendencies:

(1) a simpler cognitive structure, comprised of fewer differentiations and incomplete integration;

(2) a greater tendency toward bifurcated evaluations, viz., good-bad, right-wrong, black-white, etc.;

(3) a greater dependence on external or social definitions as criteria of validity and hence a greater dependency on authority, precedent and other extra-personal sources as guidelines to action;

(4) a greater intolerance of ambiguity, expressed in such ways as the tendency to standardize judgments more quickly of a novel situation, even at the expense of error and susceptibility of false but salient clues;

(5) a greater inability to change set and hence more stereotypy in the solution of more complex and changing problems;

(6) a greater resistance to change at low levels of stress but a greater likelihood of collapsing or going to pieces under high stress;

(7) a poor delineation between means and ends and hence a paucity of different routes to the same goal and greater disturbance of conceptual effectiveness from threat to or impairment of a set of means;

(8) a poorer capacity to "act as if" to assume the role of the other or to think and act in terms of a hypothetical situation;

(9) a less well-defined self and hence less entrance of the self as a perceived causal agent in effecting sought outcomes in one's environment (Harvey, 1961).

By focusing educational enterprise upon the conceptualization of roles and the evaluation of personal capabilities for leadership, teachers may be able to create more openness to experience, and thereby facilitate the development of more abstract cognitive functioning. At any rate, it would seem that without the development of capability for abstract functioning, i.e., under the limitations of the concrete syndrome, the achievement of the role exchange objectives would be an undertaking of extremely tenuous probability of success. The ability to achieve the role exchange objectives would seem to be dependent upon a degree of detachment of self from the situation, which implies differentiation, while being able to relate to the situation, which implies integration of self with the situation. These operations are characteristic of the most abstract end of the continuum of cognitive functioning; their achievement, and accordingly the establishment of abstract cognitive functioning, may be dependent upon the conditions under which training is conducted (Anderson and Moore, 1959). Furthermore, it would seem that the achievement of the role exchange objectives under the power and social orientations may be the necessary bridge to the achievement of the role exchange objectives under the interdependent orientation.

Toward a More Fully Democratic Man

What kind of adult would emerge from a program emphasizing mastery of the objectives specified in the relational domain? The profile of the student who achieved mastery under this taxonomy would theoretically closely resemble the Stage IV power orientation identified by McClelland (McClelland, 1975). This

profile, called social emotional maturity by McClelland, is described as follows:

> ...it does appear that men and women who reach a Stage IV expression of Power are more fully actualized. They are more responsible in organizations, less ego-involved, more willing to seek expert help when appropriate, more open with intimates. Yet one also gets the impression that such genuinely mature people have so progressed through all the stages that any modality or expression of power drive is available to them, and that finally they are free to use whichever one is appropriate to the situation. For the fact is, situations play a large part in determining the appropriateness of various modes of expression of the power drive...Maturity involves the ability to use whatever mode is appropriate to the situation. Immaturity involves using perhaps only one mode in all situations or using a mode inappropriate to a particular situation.

This conceptualization of social-emotional maturity would seem to be virtually indistinguishable from the Democrat profile on the control dimension of Schutz theory of interpersonal behavior. It also seems to capture the essence of the ideal democratic man as portrayed in the Western Cultural Tradition.

Methodology and the Relational Domain

Certain particular types of learning environments would seem to be more appropriate to the mastery of the objectives of the relational domain. Specifically environments which allow the learner to explore social relationships through direct experience, either in simulated formats or 'real world work experience' would seem to be superior to verbal or mechanically mediated experience. The logic of this assumption is based on the interactive qualities of social relationships; it is presumed that one leads by leading, not by reading about leading. Anderson and Moore (1959) identified three qualities which presumably are critical to effective instructional formats for interdependence training. These are (1) a safe environment; safety to make

mistakes; a playful atmosphere; (2) an intrinsic reward system; built in goals and source of motivation; (3) guidance in mastery of relevant techniques. Several interaction formats provide a particularly close match to these qualities; simulation games, school extracurricular activities (yearbook, school newspaper, school play), action learning formats in the community, peer teaching activities, and such out of school enterprises as Junior Achievement are excellent interaction formats in terms of the first two qualities. Given structured conceptual and evaluational activities in line with the taxonomic categories in the relational domain, they would be equally excellent with regard to the third quality, helping students learn relevant techniques, those techniques being interpersonal relations skills.

Relationships Between the Relational Taxonomy and Values/Moral Education

The objectives specified in the taxonomy bear a supportive relationship to the values education and moral education goals currently in vogue in social studies education. Kohlberg (1971), in discussing the relationship of cognitive-moral development to moral action, acknowledged the central place of ego strength in determining whether an individual will exhibit in behavior that which he rationally believes. In other words, the development of moral reasoning is a necessary but not a sufficient basis for moral behavior.

As the taxonomy of educational objectives in the relational domain would encourage and foster activities conducive to development of ego strength through the generation of success experiences, it follows that the aims of the

taxonomy in the relational domain are consistent with the aims of moral development.

A similar supportive role for the taxonomy vis a vis value analysis procedures is envisioned. Coombs and Meux (1971) suggest the capability for formulating a fully rational value judgment is--according to ego development theory--achieved only at the highest stage of ego development. Thus to the extent that the taxonomy fosters ego development, it is supportive of and consistent with the aims of value analysis.

The Taxonomy in Relation to Individualized Learning

The taxonomy is also supportive of efforts to individualized learning experiences. If we presume that students differ in terms of their position on the concrete-abstract continuum of cognitive functioning, then differing kinds of experiences are warranted in the pursuit of development of ego strength and interpersonal relations skills. The taxonomy as presently envisioned has great flexibility in terms of the kinds of cognitive capabilities accomodated. The potential for matching objectives to developmental stages as differentiated in the Harvey theory (Harvey and Schroder, 1963) is particularly pronounced. Thus stage one individuals (most concrete) probably have no need for training in leadership or followership under the power orientation. They may, however, have great need for training in leadership and/or followership under the social and interdependent orientations, and even greater need for experiences in yielding power and asserting power, which as specified earlier require conceptualization and evaluation capabilities as preconditions.

Stage two individuals would have a similar set of experiential needs with the exception of a less pronounced need for experience in yielding and asserting leadership under the power orientation. Stage three individuals, on the other hand, would be in great need of experiences with the conceptualization of leadership and followership under the interdependent orientation; and with evaluation of self and group task situations.

Thus it would appear that educational programs incorporating the relational domain would be workable only under conditions of highly individualized instructio at least in the relational domain.

The Relational Domain and Measurement

Several implications for measurement are immediately apparent from the taxonomy. The conceptualization and evaluation categories of objectives should be amenable to measurement in traditional formats, i.e., paper and pencil tests. The leadership, followership, and role exchange categories of objectives, however, would necessitate a concerted effort on the part of measurement specialists and test designers to develop new, non-traditional evaluation formats. It would seem that norm referenced evaluation would be totally out of place of these purposes; mastery learning models, however, would seem to be well suited to this domain.

Conclusion

Perhaps the most significant functional value of the taxonomy would be in providing some kind of structure for designing evaluation of action learning. Graham (1975) points out the inadequacy of current evaluation formats for the accreditation of action learning. Clearly what is lacking is the conceptualizatio

of the intended outcomes of action learning. This taxonomy does not presume to provide a complete conceptualization of the goals of action learning; it does, however, represent a start in this direction. A complete conceptualization of the goals of action learning will probably await the development of several additional taxonomies, some of them aimed more directly at self-development. Such efforts would appear to be needed now.

Bibliography

Anderson, A. R. and Moore, O. K., "Autotelic Folk Models", The Sociological Quarterly, 1. 1960.

Bloom, Benjamin S. (ed.), Taxonomy of Educational Objectives: Handbook One: Cognitive Domain, New York: David McKay, 1956.

Coombs, Jerrold R. and Meux, Milton, "Teaching Strategies for Value Analysis" in Metcalf, Lawrence (ed.), Values Education: Rationale, Strategies and Procedures, Washington, D.C.: National Council for the Social Studies, 1971.

Gibbons, Maurice, "Walkabout: Searching for the Right Passage from Childhood and School" Phi Delta Kappan, 55, 9, (May, 1974).

Graham, Richard, "Youth and Experiential Learning" in Havighurst, Robert and Drever, Philip (eds.), Youth: The Seventy-fourth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975.

Harvey, O. J., Hunt, D. E., and Schroder, H. M., Conceptual Systems and Personality Development, New York: Wiley, 1960.

Havighurst, Robert J., "Objectives for Youth Development" in Havighurst, Robert and Drever, Philip (eds.), Youth: The Seventy-fourth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975.

Hunt, M. P. and Metcalf, Lawrence, Teaching High School Social Studies, New York: Harper and Row, 1955.

Kohlberg, Lawrence and Mayer, Rochelle, "Development as the Aim of Education" Harvard Educational Review, 42, 4, (November, 1972) 449-496.

Krathwohl, David; Bloom, Benjamin S., and Masia, Bertram, Taxonomy of Educational Objectives: Handbook II: Affective Domain, New York: David McKay, 1964.

Loevinger, Jan, American Psychologist, 1966, 21, 195-217.

McClelland, David, Power: The Inner Experience, New York: Irvington Publishers, 1975.

Newmann, Fred, Education for Citizen Action: Challenge for Secondary Curriculum, Berkeley, McCutchan Publishing, 1975.

Oliver, Donald and Shaver, James, Teaching Public Issues in the High School, Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1966.

Schutz, William C., FIRO: A Three Dimensional Theory of Interpersonal Behavior, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1960.

Sullivan, C., Grant, Marguerite Q., Grant, J. D., "The Development of Interpersonal Maturity: Applications to Delinquency", Psychiatry, 1957, 20, 373-385.

TAXONOMY OF EDUCATIONAL OBJECTIVES

RELATIONAL DOMAIN

1. LEADERSHIP

Leadership, as defined here, is the ability to direct and coordinate task-relevant group activities.

1.10 Leadership (Power Orientation)
Leadership in power orientations is defined as the ability to direct and coordinate task relevant group activities through the recourse of control over positive and negative sanctions.

1.20 Leadership (Social Orientation)
Leadership in social orientations is defined as the ability to direct and coordinate task relevant group activities through the resource of persuasion.

1.30 Leadership (Interdependent Orientation)
Leadership in ethical orientations is defined as the ability to direct and coordinate task relevant group activities because of group-acknowledged superior capabilities, i.e., the influence of specialized knowledge.

2. FOLLOWERSHIP

Followership, as defined here, is the ability to accept and acknowledge the leadership of another in the pursuit and culmination of task relevant group activities. For measurement purposes, followership is defined as the ability to participate as an integral part of the group without being the leader.

2.10 Followership (Power Orientation)
Followership in power orientation is defined ad the ability to remain in a group and participate in it under conditions when another controls through the use of positive and negative sanctions.

2.20 Followership (Social Orientation)
Followership in social orientations is defined as the ability to remain in a group and participate in it under conditions when another controls through persuasion.

2.30 Followership (Interdependent Orientation)
Followership in ethical orientations is defined as the ability to remain in a group and participate in it under conditions when another directs and controls through the influence of specialized knowledge or expertise.

3. ROLE EXCHANGE (YIELDING)

Role exchange in a yielding direction is defined as the capacity to transfer the leadership of a task relevant group activity to another group member without either disrupting the group activity or withdrawing from the group.

3.10 Role Exchange-Yielding (Power Orientation)
This refers to the capacity to acknowledge the superior control of another over positive and negative sanctions and withdraw from the leadership position without either leaving the group or disrupting the activity of the group.

3.20 Role Exchange-Yielding (Social Orientation)
This refers to the capacity to recognize the superior position of another in terms of group loyalty and withdraw from the leadership position without either leaving the group or disrupting the activity of the group.

3.30 Role Exchange-Yielding (Interdependent Orientation)
This refers to the capacity to recognize the superior qualifications (knowledge and experience) of another and withdraw from the leadership position without either leaving the group or disrupting the group activity.

4. ROLE EXCHANGE-ASSERTING

Role exchange in an assertive direction is defined as the capacity to claim the leadership position from another without unnecessarily disrupting the group activities and/or necessitating the former leader's leaving the group

4.10 Role Exchange-Asserting (Power Orientation)
This refers to the capacity to use superior control over positive and negative sanctions to assert one's leadership in replacing an incumbent leader, without disruption of the group.

4.20 Role Exchange-Asserting (Social Orientation) (Persuasion Orientation)?
This refers to the capacity to use the personal loyalty of group members to assert one's leadership and replace and incumbent without disrupting the group activities or necessitating the former leader's departure from the group.

4.30 Role Exchange-Asserting (Interdependent Orientation) (Influence Orientation)?
This refers to the capacity to demonstrate one's superior knowledge and skills relevant to a group task, and thereby assume the leadership of the group from an incumbent leader.

5. CONCEPTUALIZATION

Conceptualization in this taxonomy refers to the capacity to relate to leader and follower roles on a class basis, and specify the relevant variables which determine a class of role orientations; finally, it refers to the capacity to recognize and classify leader-follower relationships as power, influence or interdependence orientations.

5.10 Conceptualization (Power Orientation)
This refers to the capacity to conceptualize power based role orientations, identifying the specific positive and negative sanctions which can be brought to bear, and any limitations to the applications of those sanctions Conceptualization of a power based role orientation may be further subdivided into the following categories of conceptualization tasks.

5.11 Conceptualization of Follower Role
This would entail the recognition of the behaviors appropriate to the role of follower in a task relevant group activity; and recognition of the outer limits of applicability of sanctions in a given situation.

5.12 Conceptualization of Leadership Role
This would entail the recognition of the behaviors appropriate to the role of power based leadership in a task relevant group activity; recognition of the range of sanctions available in a given situation.

5.20 Conceptualization (Social Orientation)
This refers to the capacity to conceptualize persuasion based role orientations identifying the specific arguments which can be brought to bear and recognizing the range across which they are appropriate. Conceptualization of a socially based role may be further subdivided into the following categories of conceptualization tasks.

5.21 Conceptualization of Follower Role
This would entail the recognition of the behaviors appropriate to the role of a follower in a task relevant group activity; and recognition of the logical basis of attempts to influence or persuade; recognition of limitations to the validity of logical structures of persuasion utilized in particular situations.

5.22 Conceptualization of Leadership Role
This would entail the recognition of the behaviors appropriate to the role of leader by virtue of persuasion; recognition of and identification of logical arguments for particular courses of action in given situations.

5.30 Conceptualization (Interdependent Orientation)
This refers to the capacity for conceptualizing a group task situation i.e., identifying all the relevant knowledge and skill capabilities and ordering knowledge and skill capabilities in terms of salience to the task.

6. EVALUATION

Evaluation in this taxonomy refers to the capacity to identify criteria for making judgments about ego's capacity for leadership in given situations and to apply those criteria objectively to self and relevant others in the given group situation, in order to determine who should most appropriately be leading in a group task situation:

6.10 Evaluation (Power Orientation)
This refers to the capacity to evaluate the power position of the leader (possibly self) in relation to the power position of others in task relevant group activities.

6.20 Evaluation (Social Orientation)
This refers to the capacity to evaluate objectively self's and others social status relative to decision-making, in terms of criteria appropriate to the task relevant group goals.

6.30 Evaluation (Interdependent Orientation)
This refers to the capacity to evaluate personal qualifications for leading on the basis of knowledge and skills relevant to the given group task situation.